

REMARKS

Drawings

Applicant has identified a typographical error in the formal drawings filed on October 11, 2001. Accordingly, Applicant submits replacement drawings.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the Examiners' participation at the telephonic interview of July 21, 2005. Present at that interview were Applicant's attorney, the examiner, and the supervisory examiner.

Applicant discussed claim 1 in the context of *Challenger* and explained the distinction between the claimed subject matter and the disclosure of *Challenger*.

Applicant also discussed the section 112 rejection of claim 1.

Objection to specification and section 112 rejection

Applicant's amendments to the independent claims render moot both the objection to the specification and the section 112 rejection of the independent claims.

Claim amendments

Applicant amends claim 1 to recite plural cache servers. Similar amendments are made to the remaining independent claims. Support for plural cache servers is found on page 3, lines 24-26 of the originally filed specification.

The extent of the revisions to claim 1 may make the claim difficult to read. For the examiner's convenience, Applicant provides a copy of the claim with no revision marks:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for enabling the generation of an updated web-page for storage in one of a plurality of cache servers, said method comprising:

implementing programmable rules executing on each of the plurality of cache servers,
each programmable rule defining a triggering event associated with its
corresponding cache server, the occurrence of the triggering event being indicative
of the existence of an obsolete portion of said web-page stored in said corresponding
cache server;

detecting an occurrence of a triggering event at a particular cache server selected from
the plurality of cache servers;

in response to the occurrence of said triggering event, causing said particular cache
server to request an update of said obsolete portion; and

receiving an updated portion of said web-page for storage at said particular cache server.

Section 102 rejection

Applicant amends claim 1 to recite programmable rules executing on the *cache server*, rather than on an origin server. The resulting system is thus a *pull*-based system. In such a system, each cache server decides for itself when to initiate an update. In effect, each cache server “pulls” content from the origin server whenever it needs to.

As indicated by the first paragraph of claim 1, each cache server has a programmable rule associated with it. The programmable rule defines a triggering event. When that triggering event occurs, the cache server requests an update.

Challenger describes a *push*-based system. In *Challenger*, it is the *origin server* (i.e. the “data server node” in FIG. 30A) and not the cache server that initiates updates. In effect, the content is *pushed* to the cache servers in response to a signal from the trigger monitor 3000. As a consequence, all cache servers are updated at the same time. Such systems are useful when all cache servers are to have identical content.

Applicant : Mark E. Kriegsman and Benjamin W.
Wyckoff
Serial No. : 09/668,110
Filed : September 22, 2000
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 11125-014001

In a system executing the claimed method, each cache server decides for itself when it needs an update. As a result, each cache server is updated on an as-needed basis, with different cache servers possible updating different content at different times. Such systems are more useful when the demand for content differs across cache servers.

Applicant submits that the claimed subject matter is thus distinct from what is disclosed by *Challenger*.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2005



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

Applicant : Mark E. Kriegsman and Benjamin W.
Wyckoff
Serial No. : 09/668,110
Filed : September 22, 2000
Page : 9 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 11125-014001

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings replaces the original drawings in file.

Attachment following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page).